

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 7, 9 as being obvious over Akram, 6,868,081 in view of Shah, 20030161295. The Examiner states that Akram teaches a system that provides a user a single analog line with multiple uses of said line; a modem (210) connected to a fixed logic system which multiplexes or demultiplexes data (220); the modem compressing a signal traveling through the analog line (element 211, col. 5, lines 15-21) and, the modem providing simultaneous transmission of two or more speech or data calls (abstract, col. 1, lines 20-45).

Akram does not teach wherein the simultaneous transmission is accomplished by compressing conventional analog voice traffic to occupy less bandwidth.

The Examiner states that Shah teaches compressing convention analog voice traffic to occupy less bandwidth (paragraph 0005).

The Examiner states it would have been obvious to implement Shah into Akram to reduce network traffic by reducing the number of actual bits required to represent a larger input sequence, therefore enhancing the performance or capacity of a file system.

The Examiner points to Shah, paragraph 5 for teaching compressing conventional analog voice traffic to occupy less bandwidth. First of all, paragraph 5 of Shah relates to the prior art. Shah teaches that the prior art discussed in paragraph 5 and other

paragraphs is not scalable and too costly to implement. Paragraph 5 of Shah relates to compression techniques which enable packetized voice traffic to be transferred over the public switched telephone network (PSTN) which is the traditional telephone network. This uses less bandwidth than typical PCM voice signals. The PSTN described relates to traditional telephone and does not relate to the internet which is then the invention provided in Shah. Shah relates to VoIP traffic packets which have IP addresses imbedded in the payloads. Akram relates to the PSTN. As seen from the Summary of the Invention and the claims of Shah, Shah specifically relates to internet protocol (IP) and IP payload addresses. This is totally against what is taught in Akram.

In fact, the section cited by Shah relates to prior art which is taught against by Shah and therefore is not useful to Akram. For all of these reasons, Claim 1 is not obvious over the prior art.

Regarding Claim 7, the Examiner states that Akram and Shah in combination would teach further comprising a speech compression algorithm requiring between about 5.6-6.4 kbps of bandwidth as to reduce network traffic by reducing the number of actual bits required to represent a larger input sequence therefore enhancing the performance or capacity of a file system.

Nowhere does the Examiner point to any teachings in either of the references regarding a speech compression algorithm which

requires between about 5.6 to 6.4 kbps of bandwidth. Therefore, the prior art cannot make this obvious since it does not teach it. For these reasons and the reasons stated above, Claim 7 is not obvious over the prior art.

Regarding Claim 9, the Examiner states Akram and Shah in combination teach wherein the system is connected to a copper line (Akram, col. 1, line 51) by a COTS modem as to reduce network traffic by reducing the number of actual bits required to represent a larger input sequence therefore enhancing the performance or capacity of a file system.

With regards to Claim 9, the Examiner points to Akram to teach that the system is connected to a copper line. Then Examiner points to col. 1, line 51 which specifically addresses the "another limitation to providing a plurality of phone lines to the vast majority of residences is the limited embedded copper plant of telephone companies". This paragraph then goes on to state "many customers are limited to simultaneously operating one or two telephonic devices" because they have a copper line. Akram goes on to state that customers are desirous of a service which goes against the use of copper lines. Therefore, Akram and Shah in combination cannot teach the use of a copper line. For these reasons and the reasons stated above, Claim 9 is not obvious over the prior art.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2, 4-5, 8-10 as being obvious over Akram in view of Shah and further in view of Staples, 6,301,399.

Regarding Claim 2, the Examiner states that Akram and Shah in combination do not teach that the modem is programmable. Staples teaches wherein the modem is programmable (col. 13, lines 10-15 and col. 16, lines 66-col. 17, line 10).

The Examiner states it would have been obvious to implement the teachings of Staples into Akram and Shah as store program instructions and data executed by the processor as taught by Staples (col. 16, lines 2-6).

Staples relates to a system and method for providing a remote user with a virtual presence to an office. A user can receive a fax on a first communication line while simultaneously performing voice communication on that line.

Akram does not even teach the use of memory so how can Akram and Shah to be programmed as needed to store all the data calls forwarded if there is no memory taught in Akram or Shah. One would need some basis to state that a device would have the necessary structure to be programmable. Therefore, there is nothing in Akram or Shah would could be used to store program instructions and data executed by the processor since no such processor exist in the two prior art references. In these reasons and the reasons stated above, Claim 2 is not obvious over the prior art.

Regarding Claim 4, the Examiner states that the combination of Akram, Shah and Staples teaches wherein the system is reprogrammed as needed to accurately store all the data calls forwarded either from the user's office telephone or from the user's home telephone.

For the reasons stated above for Claim 2, Claim 4 is not obvious over the prior art.

Regarding Claim 5, the Examiner states that the combination of Akram, Shah and Staples teaches wherein the modem is downloaded on analog lines, cable, satellite and fiber lines (Staples, col. 7, lines 14-18) as to facilitate the communication of data between two or more communications devices.

As stated above since there is no reason to combine the teachings in the references, and for the reasons stated above, Claim 5 is not obvious over the prior art.

Regarding Claim 8, the Examiner states that the combination of Akram, Shah and Staples teaches wherein the modem further comprises field programmable gate array as store program instructions and data executed by the processor as taught by Staples (Col. 16, lines 2-6).

Col. 16, lines 2-6 which is stated by the Examiner as teaching the elements of Claim 8, specifically states:

Examples of the events are the reception of telephony control messages, and the reception of data.

The telephony communication device 104 comprises a data port, or single line telephone (SLT) interface 64, for coupling to the PSTN via a communications path, such as a telephone line.

Nowhere in where the Examiner cited does it relate to a modem comprising field programmable gate array chips. Therefore, Claim 8 is not obvious over the prior art.

Regarding Claim 10, the Examiner states that the combination of Akram, Shah and Staples teaches wherein the system comprises two modems, one at each end of an analog line; a first modem compresses and multiplexes data at a source end of the line; and a second modem demultiplexes and expands data at an exchange end of a copper line (Staples, col. 7, lines 56-65) as to facilitate the communication of data between two or more communications devices.

The cite to Staples does not relate to a first modem which compresses and a second modem which decompresses. No such language is found in Staples. Further, not only does Staples not teach the use of a copper line, but as stated above, Akram teaches against using a copper line. For all of these reasons, Claim 10 is not obvious over the prior art.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 3 as being obvious over Akram in view of Shah and further in view of Bowen, 2002/0100029. Akram and Shah do not teach that the modem teach Handel-C. Bowen teaches this at Fig. 6, element 604 and paragraph 9. The Examiner states it would have been obvious to

implement Bowen into Akram and Shah to enable a software or hardware engineer to target directly FPGAs in similar fashion to classical microprocessor cross-compiler development tools as taught by Bowen.

Bowen relates to a system for designing and producing an electronic circuit. There is no reason to combine Bowen with the teachings of Akram and Shah. For these reasons and the reasons stated above, Claim 3 is not obvious over the prior art.

Applicant now believes that the application is in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EM 477781661 US
Date of Deposit: February 24, 2010
I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith
is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on
February 24, 2010

Signature:

Name: Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,



Philip M. Weiss

Reg. No. 34,751

Attorney for Applicant

Weiss & Weiss

300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251

Mineola, NY 11501

(516) 739-1500